

**REMARKS**

It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to these claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103 or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

Claims 3, 11, and 13-15 have been cancelled. Claims 2, 5-10, 12, and 16, and amended claims 1 and 4 are in this application.

Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,589,892), Strubbe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,047,867), and Ishii et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,424,790).

Amended independent claim 1 now recites in part as follows:

“recorded program information storage means for storing recorded program information for display so as to be viewable by a user which includes (i) recording medium identification information and (ii) recording start and end position information of a number of programs stored in a number of recording mediums so as to provide for each recorded program information pertaining to the respective recording medium on which the respective program is recorded and the respective start position and end position thereof on the respective recording medium **which is entirely viewable by the user in a predetermined portion of a single image wherein the predetermined portion occupies less than the entire single image so as to enable other information to be displayed therein**”  
(Underlining and bold added for emphasis.)

It is respectfully submitted that the proposed combination of Knee, Strubbe, and Ishii do not specifically disclose the above features of amended independent claim 1.

For example, in explaining the above 103 rejection of claim 1, the Examiner appears to rely on Strubbe (in particular, Fig. 4, H, tape #3, tape#5 thereof) “for storing information concerning programs on other tapes...” (See page 3, lines 2-4 of the present Office Action.) It is respectfully submitted that such portion of Strubbe (hereinafter merely “Strubbe”) even if combined with Ishii in the manner proposed by the Examiner would produce the above-mentioned feature of claim 1. That is, the proposed combination of Strubbe and Ishii does not provide “recorded program information storage means for storing ...so as to provide for each recorded program information pertaining to the respective recording medium on which the respective program is recorded and the respective start position and end position thereof on the respective recording medium **which is entirely viewable by the user in a predetermined portion of a single image wherein the predetermined portion occupies less than the entire single image so as to enable other information to be displayed therein,**” as in claim 1. An example of such “predetermined portion of a single image” is the “Prog Info Area” A2 shown in Fig. 5A of the present application. As clearly shown therein, “other” information may be displayed on the single image such as in listing area A4. On the other hand, the proposed combination of Strubbe and Ishii appears to merely provide an image or so-called “menu” page wherein **only** tape number and start/end position information is displayed within the entire image so as **not** to enable other information to be displayed thereon.

Accordingly, amended claim 1 is believed to be distinguishable from the proposed combination of Knee, Strubbe, and Ishii.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to claim 1, amended independent claim 4 is also believed to be distinguishable from the proposed combination of Knee, Strubbe, and Ishii.


Claims 2, 5-10, 12, and 16 are dependent from one of independent claims 1 and 4 and, due to such dependency, are also believed to be distinguishable from the proposed combination of Knee, Strubbe, and Ishii for at least the reasons previously described.

In view of the foregoing, entry of this amendment, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12, and 16 and the allowance of this application with claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12, and 16 are respectfully requested.

It is to be appreciated that the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art represent the present opinions of the applicants' undersigned attorney and, in the event, that the Examiner disagrees with any such opinions, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where, in the reference or references, there is the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response and not paid herewith to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,  
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:   
Dennis M. Smid  
Reg. No. 34,930  
(212) 588-0800